

24



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,889	06/29/2001	Gerald Johann Wilmot	1854P/STL9-2000-0070US1	7236

7590 12/17/2003

Mr. Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
SAWYER GROUP
P.O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,889

Applicant(s)

WILMOT ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Y Chen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Ule

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-29 are presented for examination.

The document # 200020362 is not submitted to the Office as cited IDS, hence is not considered.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities: for example, the text description of modules of Fig(s). 2-3 are not readable. Thus, the Applicant is requested to verify and fix all possible errors. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2171

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As to claims 1, 11 and 21, applicant did not define the metes and bounds of the claimed subject matters "long term", "opaque data types" and "library control functions". Furthermore, applicant fails to disclose the mechanism for converging the claimed library control functions to ensure data integrity of opaque data types in the claimed database system. In addition, applicant also fails to disclose the links among the claimed "long term", database system, and library control functions. Therefore, it is not enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

As to claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-29, these claims have the same defects as their base claims, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following recitation of the claims is not understood:

As to claims 1, 11 and 21, the claim subject matters such as "long term", "library control functions" and "Opaque data types" varies from person to person, application to application and system to system, since the applicant fails to clearly define these subject matters, thus the claimed features are indefinite. Furthermore, it is not understood how the claimed library functions were integrated with SQL statements to ensure data integrity for the claimed opaque data types? What are those claimed opaque data types? How to associate the claimed opaque data types with the claimed database system, the library control functions and the updating/editing operations of the claimed long term?

As to claims 4, 14 and 23, it is not understood what is it meant by "providing library control functions further comprises creating a set of side control tables for each selected table that contains library-controlled columns" [i.e., What are the claimed library-controlled columns? What is the structure of side control tables? How to map the claimed side control tables to each of the claimed selected table? Why create these side control tables? How to associate these tables to the claimed library control functions?]

As to claims 2-3, 5-10, 12-13, 15-20, 22, and 23-29, these claims have the same defects as their base claims, therefore, are rejected for the same reason.

Because of the ambiguous nature of the claimed invention, the following art rejections are based on the examiner's best understanding.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hammack et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,624).

As to claims 1, 11 and 21, Hammack et al. (hereinafter referred as Hammack) discloses a system [e.g. the Process Control System (10), Fig. 1; the Version Control and Audit Trail System (VCAT) 98, Fig. 4] with method and computer program product [e.g. the Configuration Application (96), Fig. 4, the Delta V® Explorer, col. 6, lines 28-33] for allowing large object (e.g., the XML document) updating and edit control in a

Art Unit: 2171

database system [e.g., the Version Control Database (102), the Configuration Database (100), Fig. 4], comprising:

a) at least one computer processing device [e.g. the Controller (12), Fig. 1; the plurality of workstations (14), Fig. 1; col. 7, lines 58-61] and;

b) a database management system [e.g., the Delta Vtm, the MicroSoft SQL Server ® , col. 21, lines 27-32] installed on the at least one computer processing device, , such that the database management system can support utilization of library control functions [e.g. the library folder (88), Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 44 – 46] via the SQL statement to ensure the data integrity for the database [e.g. the Rollback command supported by the DBMS, col. 16, lines 12-26, lines 46-59].

As to claim 2-3, 12-13 and 22, Hammack further discloses that the system supports the checkout [e.g., 110, Fig. 5; 116, Fig. 7], update [e.g., the Edit function at the tool bar, Fig. 2] and delete [e.g., the Delete function, Fig. 6] functions.

As to claims 4-6, 14-16 and 23-24, since the claimed feature lack of antecedent basis, therefore, the office gives no patentable weight to this set of claims.

As to claims 7, 17 and 26, Hammack further discloses using library control functions to control the access of a workflow document [e.g., Fig. 3; col. 6, lines 25-63].

As to claims 8-10, 18-20, 27-29, Hammack further discloses his system supports the features claimed by applicant, such as: a) the XML workflow document processing [e.g. see col. 21, lines 33-65]; b) the XML document can be received by electronic mail [e.g. the message dialog, 174, Fig. 15]; and c) the document can be decomposed and streamlined [e.g., see col. 22, lines 17-67].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Gustman (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,499) which disclosed a digital library system to capture, catalog, and management object data items; Antognini et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,649,185), which teaches a system to provide access to a library of digitized documents and images; Van Huben et al. (U.S. Patent NO. 6,654,747), which provides a system for managing data in a heterogeneous environment with generic structure for control access transactions. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/895,889

Page 8

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-6296.

Susan Chen
Dec. 4, 2003

Ule
UYEN LE
AU 2171